

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 6-30 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 15-30 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-30 remain at issue.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rose et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,709) in view of *Horstmann* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,401). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a content distribution system for performing content transaction management. The content distribution system comprises a plurality of user devices among which the content transaction management allows a content to be secondarily distributed, a secure container containing the content encrypted by a content key and container information including conditions set for a transaction of the content, a first section for distributing the content by transmitting said secure container, and a second section for performing person authentication. The second container performs person authentication when said secure container is transmitted among said plurality of user devices, based on a person identification certificate (hereinafter, simply referred to as an IDC) which includes a template having biometric information, encrypted in one of a plurality of manners, serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction and which is identified in reference to an IDC identifier list.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the person identification certificate (IDC) used for performing person authentication includes a template having biometric information. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Rose et al.* does not disclose transmitting the container of claim 1 using biometric

information. (May 29, 2007 Office Action, page 5.) *Rose et al.* is directed to distributing a trial use of a licensed application program. A user accepts the license by typing an identification name or a verification code. (col. 7, line 19-23.) Alternatively, the acceptance may be more passive, such that unless the user declines to accept the license terms, the license is accepted. (col. 7, lines 23-25.) Thus, in contrast to claim 1, *Rose et al.* does not disclose or suggest the use of a person identification certificate which includes a template having biometric information. Likewise, *Horstmann* is devoid of the use of a person identification certificate which includes a template having biometric information.

Since neither *Rose et al.* nor *Horstmann*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this limitation, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited art. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 and 6-14 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4 and 6-14 are allowable over the cited art.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 29, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000